

# DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210

801-538-5340

801-359-3940 (Fax)

801-538-7223 (TDD)

Kathleen Clarke **Executive Director** 

Michael O. Leavitt

Governor

Lowell P. Braxton Division Director PO Box 145801 Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801

Partial:\_\_\_\_

Complete: XXX Exploration:

NOW/ENE

INSPECTION REPORT

Date of Last Inspection: 01/30/2001

Mine Name: Banning Loadout	County: Carbon	Permit Number:	C/007/034			
Permittee and/or Operator's Name:	Canyon Fuel Company					
Business Address: P.O. Box 1029,	Wellington, Utah 84542					
Type of Mining Activity: Undergrou	nd Surface	Prep. Plant _	Other			
Company Official(s): Messrs. Dave	Spillman and Gary Taylo	or				
State Official(s): Peter Hess, Daron	Haddock, Gregg Galecki,	Paul Baker Federal	Official(s): None			
Weather Conditions: Windy, cold, Chill factor in 20's Fahrenheit						
Existing Acreage: Permitted 36	Disturbed 21.6	RegradedS	Seeded			
Status: Active XXX						

# REVIEW OF PERMIT, PERFORMANCE STANDARDS & PERMIT CONDITION REQUIREMENTS

- Substantiate the elements on this inspection by checking the appropriate performance standard.
  - For complete inspections provide narrative justification for any elements not fully inspected unless element is not appropriate to the site, in which case check N/A.
  - For partial inspections check only the elements evaluated.
- Document any noncompliance situation by referencing the NOV issued at the appropriate performance standard listed below. 2.
- Reference any narratives written in conjunction with this inspection at the appropriate performance standard listed below.
- Provide a brief status report for all pending enforcement actions, permit conditions, Division Orders, and amendments.

		<b>EVALUATED</b>	<u>N/A</u>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	NOV/ENI
1.	PERMITS, CHANGE, TRANSFER, RENEWAL, SALE	[X]	$\Box$	[X]	$\Box$
2.	SIGNS AND MARKERS	[X]	$\coprod$	$\Box$	
3.	TOPSOIL	[X]	$\Box$	[X]	
4.	HYDROLOGIC BALANCE:				
	a. DIVERSIONS	[X]	$\Box$	П	П
	b. SEDIMENT PONDS AND IMPOUNDMENTS	[X]	$\Box$	[X]	$\Box$
	c. OTHER SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES	[X]	$\Box$	[X]	$\Box$
	d. WATER MONITORING	[X]	$\Box$	[X]	$\Box$
	e. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS	[X]	$\Box$	Ц	
5.	EXPLOSIVES	П	[X]	$\Box$	П
6.	DISPOSAL OF EXCESS SPOIL/FILLS/BENCHES	П	[X]		
7.	COAL MINE WASTE/REFUSE PILES/IMPOUNDMENTS	_	[X]		П
8.	NONCOAL WASTE	[X]	$\Box$	$\Box$	$\Box$
9.	PROTECTION OF FISH, WILDLIFE AND RELATED				
	ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	[X]	$\Box$		П
	SLIDES AND OTHER DAMAGE	П	[X]	$\Box$	П
11.	CONTEMPORANEOUS RECLAMATION	П	[X]		П
	BACKFILLING AND GRADING	П	[X]		Ц
	REVEGETATION	. []	[X]	П	Ц
14.	SUBSIDENCE CONTROL	П	[X]	П	Ц
	CESSATION OF OPERATIONS	[X]	П	П	
16.	ROADS:				
	a. CONSTRUCTION/MAINTENANCE/SURFACING	[X]	П	Ц	Ц
	b. DRAINAGE CONTROLS	[X]	Ц	Ц	Ц
	OTHER TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES	[X]	Ш	Ц	Ц
	SUPPORT FACILITIES/UTILITY INSTALLATIONS	[X]	Ц	Ц	П
	AVS CHECK (4th Quarter- April, May, June)	[X]	Ц	Ц	Ц
	AIR QUALITY PERMIT	[X]	Ц	Ц	Ц
21	RONDING & INSURANCE	[X]	[]	[ ]	[]

#### INSPECTION REPORT

(Continuation sheet)

PERMIT NUMBER: <u>C/007/034</u>

DATE OF INSPECTION: <u>04/04/2001</u>

( COMMENTS ARE NUMBERED TO CORRESPOND WITH TOPICS LISTED ABOVE )

# **GENERAL COMMENTS**

A midterm permit review site visit was conducted on April 4, 2001 for the Banning Siding. Members of the Salt Lake City UDNR/OGM technical staff attended including Messrs. Daron Haddock, Permit Supervisor; Paul Baker, Senior Reclamation Specialist-Biology; Gregg Galecki, Reclamation Specialist-Hydrology; and Peter Hess, Reclamation Specialist III-Mining Engineer/Inspector. Messrs. Dave Spillman, Manager of Technical Services, and Gary Taylor, Environmental/Mining Engineer represented the permittee.

## 1. PERMITS, CHANGE, TRANSFER, RENEWAL, SALE

The permittee presently has amendment C/007/034-AM01A, Silt Fence Removal submitted to the Division which would allow the removal of several silt fences which were installed along the primary coal haul access road to the site. In order to handle runoff from the road, a road grader bladed the outslopes of the haul road, removing the native vegetation in order to create the ditches to route the flows to the natural drainages. The permittee installed silt fences adjacent to the inlets and discharge ends of the road culverts to treat this runoff, prior to same, reporting off the permit area. The silt fences have been in place for fourteen years, and several are to the point that maintenance is needed. As the Utah R645 coal mining rules do not require the treatment of road runoff, and the site is in a temporary cessation status, the permittee is desirous to remove the silt fences, rather than continuing to maintain them. Mr. Galecki is performing the review for the Division, and today's site visit was helpful in allowing him to formulate his determination. Banning sits in a very nearly flat area, immediately NE of the Mounds railroad junction. The area has been used for the rail transportation of coal since the early nineteenth century.

#### 3. TOPSOIL

The Banning Siding site was completed and brought into full operation in 1978. As most of the earthwork was completed prior to the passage of SMCRA in August of 1977, there was no topsoil salvaged for reclamation purposes.

## 4B. HYDROLOGIC BALANCE: SEDIMENT PONDS AND IMPOUNDMENTS

The first quarter 2001 impoundment inspection was conducted by Mr. Jim Byers, engineering technician, on January 8, 2001. The Banning site only has one sediment pond, which is incised. There were no signs of instability, or other hazards noted by Mr. Byers during the permittee's inspection. The sediment level in the pond was reported as being well below the established sediment clean-out marker (approximately eight feet below the primary spillway discharge elevation).

The second quarter 2001 impoundment inspection was conducted on April 3, 2001, again, by Mr. Byers. There were no problems noted by either Mr. Byers on April 3, or by this individual on April 4, during the midterm permit review site inspection.

#### INSPECTION REPORT

(Continuation sheet)

PERMIT NUMBER: C/007/034

DATE OF INSPECTION: 04/04/2001

#### 4C. HYDROLOGIC BALANCE: OTHER SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES

Relative to the silt fences along the primary haul road mentioned in topic 1, the inspection team was in concurrence that the fences could be removed, with the stipulation that, if erosional cutting started to appear on the gradual slopes near the inlets and outlets of the road culverts, the erosion would be corrected. Mr. Spillman was in agreement with this.

As the site is in temporary cessation, Mr. Spillman requested that the midterm review team evaluate several other silt fence locations within the disturbed area perimeter. These included the silt fences located adjacent to the border of ASCA Area #3 and ASCA Area #4; this was installed to prevent the transportation of coal fines off the permit area by surface flow. As the site is under temporary cessation, the permittee felt that it might be possible to remove this fence from duty, because there is, at present, no means to produce additional coal fines to this area, i.e., there is at present, no coal stockpile contributing wind-borne coal fines to the ASCA's adjacent to the drainages located on the North side of the inbound truck road. The OGM review team concluded that these silt fences should be left in place and maintained as needed.

The silt fences at the South end of ASCA Area #2 were also inspected. These fences were also installed to prevent surface flows from transporting coal fines off the permit area. The permittee's intent here was to remove these fences during the temporary cessation period at the site, and then reinstall them if the site should become active, and a storage pile be built. The group felt that, in general, there was still enough coal on the surface storage pad to generate wind borne fines into the low depressions where surface drainage could pick them up and transport them off the permit area, (i.e., an off-site impact). There are two fences here in series; one is in dire need of repair. Mr. Spillman agreed to replace the fabric on the fence which needed repair. It was felt that only one fence was needed in this area; hence the permittee was authorized to remove the fence on the east side.

# 4D. HYDROLOGIC BALANCE: WATER MONITORING

During today's midterm permit review inspection, Gregg Galecki elaborated on the reporting of a -11.6% cation/anion balance for the November 17, 1997 truck dump sump water sample. Water samples pulled from this location for the years 1996, 1998, 1999, and 2000 all reported acceptable balances, i.e., less than 5% error. Mr. Galecki also mentioned that total iron and total manganese had not been run for the 1996, 1997, and 1998 samples.

The fact that the currently approved water monitoring regimes for the Banning site (Chapter 7) is not specific about total and dissolved parameters was discussed.

It is Mr. Spillman's intent to submit a revised Chapter 7 to the Division for review.

The permittee is not required to conduct water monitoring during the first quarter of the year. An analytical review of the September 27, 2000 water sample from the truck dump sump (performed on November 17, 2000) revealed that the permittee did have all of the required analytical parameters analyzed. Operational parameters are listed in Table 3 of the mining and reclamation plan.

#### INSPECTION REPORT

(Continuation sheet)

PERMIT NUMBER: **C/007/034** 

DATE OF INSPECTION: 04/04/2001

The water data base currently lists four water monitoring points at the Banning site; two are UPDES outfalls. UPDES point #002 is the sediment pond outfall, which has never discharged. UPDES point #001 is the ground water monitoring point in the truck dump sump, which is pumped into the sediment pond rather than allowed to discharge to an unnamed tributary of Grassy Trail Creek. The permittee does this to eliminate the need to sample, and pay for laboratory analysis of that sample. The well sample listed is the ground water monitoring point in the truck sump, which is monitored once a year during the fall. The fourth sample point is named the "straw bales quantity", which is required by the currently approved mining and reclamation plan to be a sample which is taken during a precipitation event, as the flow reports through straw bales. The permittee questions the necessity of this sample from a need to validate the effectiveness of treatment perspective. Also, in order to get a sample to report through a straw bale, a fairly large volume of water must report to the bale. This would more than likely only occur during a thunderstorm event. Placing a person in this flat-lying country during a thunderstorm is unsafe, due to the potential for lightning strikes. The permittee intends to request a deletion of this sample point from the surface water monitoring regime via the permitting process.

Discharge monitoring reports for the months of October, November, and December, 2000, as well as the report forms for January and February, 2001 were reviewed. There were no outfalls from the sediment pond during this period. All reports were submitted in a timely fashion.

Inspector's Signature:

Peter Hess #46

Date: April 13, 2001

Note: This inspection report does not constitute an affidavit of compliance with the regulatory program of the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining.

sd

cc: James Fulton, OSM

Rick Olsen, Canyon Fuel Dave Spillman, Canyon Fuel

Price Field office

O:\007034.BAN\Compliance\2001\c 0404.wpd